

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the above amendments and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 29-31, 34-53, and 55 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Claims 29-31, 34-43, 47, 53, and 55 are amended; Claims 28 and 32 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer; and no claims are added. Support for the amendments to Claims 43 and 47 may be found in Claims 32 and 54, as previously presented, for example. Support for the amendments to Claims 29-31, 34-42, 53, and 55 is self-evident. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added by this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 28 is objected to for informalities; Claims 28-32, 35-38, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Trpkovski (U.S. 2003/0047538) in view of Wyatt et al. (U.S. 3,654,438, hereinafter “Wyatt”); Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Trpkovski in view of Wyatt and Urbish et al. (U.S. 5,734,343, hereinafter “Urbish”); Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Trpkovski in view of Wyatt and a public use or sale of Anderson Windows (*see* Anderson Windows endorsed catalog); Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Trpkovski in view of Wyatt and a public use and sale of Anderson Windows; and Claims 43-53 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Trpkovski in view of Wyatt and Urbish.

At the outset, Applicants thank Examiner Stanford for the courtesy of the interview conducted on November 29, 2010. During the interview, Examiner Stanford indicated that discussed claim amendments would overcome the outstanding rejections and would place the application in condition for allowance. A statement of the substance of the interview, in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 713.04, is provided herein by virtue of the comments and claim amendments reiterated below.

Regarding the objection to Claim 28, and the rejections of Claims 28-32, 35-39, 41, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Claims 28 and 32 are hereby canceled, and amended Claims 29-31, 35-38, 41, and 42, which now depend from Claim 47, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed below regarding Claim 47. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to Claim 28 and rejections of Claims 28-32, 35-39, 41, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 43-53 and 55 as unpatentable over Trpkovski in view of Wyatt and Urbish, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Amended independent Claim 43 is directed to a method for identifying a glazing unit including at least one marking element visible from outside of the glazing unit and visually identifiable by whomsoever. This method includes, in part:

correlating via the computer database the one or more hexadecimal numbers with an item of information in the computer database, the item of information including characteristics unique to the glazing unit on which the marking element is visible, the correlating including relating the one or more hexadecimal numbers to a string of numbers of an identifier representing the item of information, each of the one or more hexadecimal numbers of the at least one marking element comprising a hexadecimal coding of a number of the string of numbers of the identifier.

As discussed during the interview, none of Trpkovski, Wyatt, and Urbish teaches or suggests at least the above-noted feature. Trpkovski does not disclose identifying one or more hexadecimal numbers from a string of characters of the at least one marking element, which is acknowledged by the outstanding Office Action.¹ Thus, it follows that Trpkovski also fails to relate the one or more hexadecimal numbers to a string of numbers of an identifier, as recited in Claim 43. Wyatt is limited to an arrangement that permits the user to perform algebraic and arithmetic operations in hexadecimal base and then convert from

¹ See outstanding Office Action at page 12, lines 1 and 2, for example.

hexadecimal to decimal.² Wyatt provides no teaching or suggestion for correlating via the computer database the one or more hexadecimal numbers with an item of information in the database, the correlating including relating the one or more hexadecimal numbers to a string of numbers of an identifier representing an item of information, each of the one or more hexadecimal numbers of the at least one marking element comprising an hexadecimal coding of a number of the string of numbers of the identifier, as recited in Claim 43. Further, Urbish and Anderson Windows fail to remedy the deficiencies of Trpkovski and Wyatt, as these references fail to discuss hexadecimal numbers, much less correlating via the computer database the one or more hexadecimal numbers with an item of information in the computer database, as recited in Claim 43.

Further, Claim 47 recites, in part, “the identification device correlating the one or more hexadecimal numbers to information in the computer database by relating the one or more hexadecimal numbers to a string of numbers of an identifier representing the information, each of the one or more hexadecimal numbers of the at least one marking element comprising a hexadecimal coding of a number of the string of numbers of the identifier.” None of the cited art teaches or suggests at least this feature for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to Claim 43.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 43 and 47, and all claims depending therefrom, patentably define over any proper combination of the cited references. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claims 43-53 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Consequently, for the reasons discussed in detail above, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

² See Wyatt at col. 1, lines 58-61, for example.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is needed to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)

Michel E. Bohn
Registration No. 64,814